the intuition and the reason,—an intuition which
.gives us the touch of things and a reason which
investigates their truth by its conceptive knowledge.
But we must note also that even if our image view
of the universe, our sense-transcript, is a system of
symbol images and not an exact reproduction or
transcription, a literal translation, still a symbol is a
notation of something that is, a transcript of realities.
Even if our images are incorrect, what they
^endeavour to image are realities, not illusions; when
we see a tree or a stone or an animal, it is not a
non-existent figure, a hallucination that we are
seeing; we may not be sure that the image is exact,
we may concede that other-sense might very well see
it otherwise, but still there is something there that
justifies the image, something with which it has
more or less correspondence. But in the theory of
Illusion the only reality is an indeterminable
featureless pure Existence, Brahman, and there is
JIO possibility of its being translated or mistranslated
into a system of symbol-figures, for that could only
be if this Existence had some determinate contents
'or some unmanifested truths of its being which could
be transcribed into the forms or names given to

them by our consciousness: a pure Indeterminable
•cannot be rendered by a transcript, a multitude of
representative differentiae, a crowd of symbols or
images; for there is in it only a pure Identity, there
is nothing to transcribe, nothing to symbolise,
nothing to image. Therefore the dream analogy
fails us altogether and is better put out of the way;